



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/530,303	10/24/2005	Maarten Peter Bodlaender	NL 020958	9921

7590 08/20/2007
Philips Electronics North America Corporation
Corporate Patent Counsel
P O Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510

EXAMINER

PARK, JEONG S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2154

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

08/20/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/530,303

Applicant(s)

BODLAENDER ET AL.

Examiner

Jeong S. Park

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 October 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/15/2006.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

1. Claims 2 and 3 are objected to because of the following informalities:

In claim 2, line 1, the word "method" should be corrected as --the method-- for clear understanding of the claim. Similar correction should be made for claim 3.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

3. Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 8 is drawn towards a computer program product. The computer program product is not in one of the statutory categories.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

5. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Cheshire et al. (hereinafter Cheshire)(Dynamic Configuration of IPv4 Link-Local Addresses, IETF draft, published on April 15 2002).

Regarding claims 1, 4, 8 and 9, Cheshire teaches as follows:

A method or a system of establishing a communication address of a device (host)(a host automatically configures an interface with an IPv4 address for link-local communication on that interface, see, e.g., page 1, abstract, lines 9-12), the method comprising:

obtaining a main address (a host selects an address using a pseudo-random number generator, see, e.g., page 8, section 2.1, lines 1-7);

using the main address (IPv4 address) as communication address of the device (a host automatically configures an interface with an IPv4 address for link-local communication on that interface, see, e.g., page 1, abstract, lines 9-12);

monitoring whether a collision occurs when using the main address (address collision) as communication address (ongoing address conflict detection, see, e.g., page 10, section 2.5, lines 1-10);

resolving the collision (conflicting ARP packet) by obtaining a new main address for use as communication address of the device characterized in that the method comprises (a host elects to configure a new link-local IP address, see, e.g., page 11, section 2.5, lines 11-12):

obtaining a backup address (configure a new link-local IP address, see, e.g., page 11, section 2.5, lines 11-12); and

resolving the collision comprises using the backup address (newly configured link-local IP address) as communication address of the device if the collision with the main address occurs (host communicates with new link-local IP address, see, e.g., page 11, section 2.5, lines 11-12).

Regarding claims 2 and 5, Cheshire teaches as follows:

each interface on a host may have a link-local address in addition to zero or more other addresses configured, so the host can select the other address configured to send its packet when address collision occurs with the link-local address (see, e.g., page 12, section 2.6, first four paragraphs).

Therefore Cheshire inherently teaches the maintaining the open network connection even at the address collision incident.

Regarding claims 3 and 6, Cheshire teaches as follows:

obtaining a new backup address if a collision occurs with the backup address (a host continuous configures another new address whenever the present address collides, see, e.g., page 11, section 2.5, lines 11-12).

Regarding claim 7, Cheshire teaches as follows:

The host have a link-local address in addition to other address configured by DHCP server, so the host can send a packet or initiate a TCP connection (see, e.g., page 12, section 2.6, lines 1-5); and

The host has access from a remote Web browser and accepts incoming HTTP connections (see, e.g., page 14, section 2.8, 6th and 7th paragraphs).

Therefore Cheshire inherently teaches that the host is Internet enabled device.

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeong S. Park whose telephone number is 571-270-

Art Unit: 2154

1597. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 7:30 - 5:00 EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nathan Flynn can be reached on 571-272-1915. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

JP

August 10, 2007

NATHAN FLYNN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

